R E P O R T R E S U M E S

ED 012 050 CG 000 037

CRITERIA FOR COUNSELOR PERFORMANCE.

BY- MUTHARD, JOHN E. MILLER, LEONARD A.
IOWA UNIV., IOWA CITY, COLL. OF EDUCATION

PUB DATE 66

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.09 HC-$1.08 27P.

DESCRIPTORS- *COUNSELOR EVALUATION, *REHABILITATION COUNSELING, STATE PROGRAMS, *STATISTICAL SURVEYS, VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION, *COUNSELOR PERFORMANCE, EVALUATION TECHNIQUES, PEARSON PRODUCT MOMENT CORRELATION, COWORKER RATING BLANK, JOB SATISFACTION INVENTORY, CLUSTER ANALYSIS, IOWA CITY

THIS RESEARCH CONCERNS THE RELATIONSHIPS AMONG REHABILITATION COUNSELOR PERFORMANCE CRITERIA CURRENTLY BEING USED OR READILY AVAILABLE TO STATE VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION AGENCIES. THE 143 COUNSELORS STUDIED CAME FROM MIDDLE-SIZED AGENCIES IN SIX STATES AND. SINCE COWORKER RATINGS WERE REQUIRED, THE SAMPLE WAS LIMITED TO COUNSELORS WORKING WITH TWO OTHER COUNSELORS AND A SUPERVISOR. THE FOLLOWING PERFORMANCE MEASURES AND RATING PROCEDURES--THE COWORKER RATING BLANK, SUPERVISOR RATINGS, EFFICIENCY RATINGS, JOB SATISFACTION INVENTORY, AVERAGE CASELOAD, AVERAGE NUMBER OF CLOSURES, AND CASELOAD VELOCITY INDEX--ARE DESCRIBED AND RELIABILITY DATA GIVEN. THE EIGHT VARIABLES WHICH RESULTED WERE CORRELATED AND A CLUSTER ANALYSIS OF THE MEASURES WAS MADE. THE TWO RESULTING CLUSTERS WERE "CASE MANAGEMENT" AND "PERFORMANCE RATING." THIS DOCUMENT WAS PUBLISHED IN "THE CRITERIA PROBLEM IN REHABILITATION COUNSELING" AS CHAPTER IV (PP. 28-34), APPENDIX C (PP. 73-82), AND REFERENCES (PP. 123-129). (PS)

ED012050

CG 000 037

THE CRITERIA PROBLEM IN REHABILITATION COUNSELING

John E. Muthard

and

Leonard A. Miller

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

College of Education
THE UNIVERSITY OF IOWA
Iowa City, Iowa

1966

CG000037

CG 000 037

CHAPTER IV

CRITERIA FOR COUNSELOR PERFORMANCE

As we indicated earlier, the need and value of research on the criteria for rehabilitation counselor performance is substantial; the development of selection, evaluation and training procedures which are research-based can only move ahead on a sound basis after some criteria are set. The value of research in these areas will, to a significant degree, hinge upon the type and quality of the criteria used. This chapter reports on that phase of our research which examined the relationships among rehabilitation counselor performance criteria currently being used or readily available to state vocational rehabilitation agencies. Either simple inspection or cluster analysis will show the relationships among these criteria, and will suggest which combination of criteria will account for most of the variance associated with the nine variables studied.

Procedures of the Study

Sample: The 143 counselors studied here came from the following six states: Connecticut, Iowa, Minnesota, Missouri, North Carolina and Oklahoma. All the agencies selected were middle-sized, general vocational rehabilitation agencies. As can be seen, some geographic representation was obtained, but both accessibility and willingness to cooperate in the study were considerations in selecting the states. To be included in the study, a counselor had to have been employed at least one full year during the three-year period studied so that closure and caseload data would be available. Since Co-Worker Ratings required at least two co-worker ratings to be an effective instruments, we also limited our sample to counselors who worked in a co-worker relationship with two other counselors and a supervisor.

Instruments: The following performance measures and rating procedures were used:

1. The Co-Worker Rating Blank: This blank (Appendix C) incorporates six evaluation dimensions and an overall judgment. It has an eight-step scale, and was used by both co-workers and supervisors to assess the counselor performance against what they think is the ideal for each statement. Only ratings on overall performance were used.

2. Supervisor Ratings: Supervisors used the same blank as the co-workers in making their ratings.

3. Efficiency Ratings: This label includes the rating schemes presently used in four of the six state agencies and the efficiency ratings made by at least two administrators in the two other states which, at the time of the study, did not have a systematic, quantifiable procedure for evaluating counselors.

4. Job Satisfaction Inventory: A Job Satisfaction Inventory (JSI) (Appendix D), constructed by Johnson (1955), was modified to obtain more variability of response and to eliminate nondiscriminating items. Chapter VI reports our research on it. In this part of our research, only the total score on the JSI was used.

5. Average Caseload: The counselor caseload is obtained by taking all of the people a counselor was working with when the fiscal year began plus all of the people accepted by him for rehabilitation services in that year. The index was secured by averaging caseload size for the fiscal years 1960, 1961 and 1962.

6. Average Number of Closures: The same three-year period (1 July 1959-30 June 1962) was used to determine the mean number of closures in each category: (1) 12 closures - the number of clients rehabilitated; (2) 13 closures - those clients to whom services were given but who were not judged rehabilitated; (3) 15 closures - those clients who were accepted for services but were interrupted before substantial services were given and/or the client became employable.

7. Caseload Velocity Index: This criterion measures the rapidity with which the counselor develops plans for action with the client or provides rehabilitation services. To derive it, random samples of ten 12 closures and ten 13 closures for the 1961-1962 year were taken for each counselor. Each case in the sample was checked to see how long, by months, it had previously been in Status 1. A mean length of time score was used as the index since some counselors did not close at least ten cases in these categories. Time in Status 1 was taken as a best index of case movement since we thought that factors which influence movement are most directly under the counselor's control during this stage.

With the exception of co-worker and supervisor ratings, the above data were available from the administrative files of each of the state agencies. Where our efficiency rating form needed to be used, a global judgment (almost always - rarely effective) was secured by submitting it to the state office staff responsible for case service activity. The Co-Worker Ratings and the Supervisor Ratings based on the Co-Worker Rating Blank were either administered in large groups including all counselors in the state or by distribution to district offices. Precautions were taken so that the Co-Worker Ratings would be confidential and would not be seen by either district or state staff.

Reliability Data: In two instances where efficiency ratings were secured, a reliability coefficient of .85 was obtained for the average ratings. Average ratings on the Co-Worker Rating Blank yielded a reliability coefficient of .87 for averages analysed by analysis of variance procedures (Lindquist, 1953). The reliability coefficient for supervisor ratings was .56. Since we had each supervisor rating different counselors, the reliability of supervisor ratings were estimated from what the counselor ratings would be if treated individually rather than as mean scores. The JSI yielded a split-half reliability coefficient of .91.

Results

After inspection for linearity by the use of scatter-plots, the eight variables of Table 10 were intercorrelated, using Pearsonian correlation. Since one of the measures used in our study, the JSI, is not a performance measure, we are not including it in Table 10 but will discuss it briefly below. Tables 11 and 12 present cluster analysis findings.

General Analysis of Intercorrelations: From Table 10, we can see that there is only a limited degree of association among the criteria studied. Even the highest correlation, that between size of caseload and number of 12 closures, reflects only 36 per cent common variance. An analysis of the average intercorrelation of each variable with all others also showed that caseload, which had the highest average, correlated .28 with the others and thus accounts for only eight per cent of the variance. To some extent, our discussion of the content analysis will also bring out the large amount of specific variance and error (i.e. unreliability) variance associated with each index. As you can see, total JSI scores did not correlate significantly with any of the performance criteria.

Cluster Analysis: Cluster analysis has an objective similar to factor analysis - the more parsimonious description of a larger group of variables. Although it is relatively less precise mathematically, and does not give altogether the same information as factor analysis, it does serve the objective of parsimony fairly adequately. In addition, it is simpler to do and understand than factor analysis.

In Table 11, we note that two clusters of three variables each were formed. The average intra-cluster correlations were .48 and .33, while the average intercorrelations of the cluster with all other variables were .13 and .11, respectively. The first cluster obtained might well be called "case management" since

TABLE 10

THE INTERCORRELATIONS OF NINE MEASURES OF REHABILITATION COUNSELOR PERFORMANCE IN STATE DVR'S
Pearsonian Correlations (N=143)

	Case Velocity	Present State Rating	Caseload	Supervisor Ratings	Number of 12 Closures	Number of 13 Closures	Number of 15 Closures	Job Satis-faction
Co-Worker Ratings	13*	25**	-03	32**	06	-01	-09	04
Case Velocity		08	-20±	14	04	03	18±	00
Present State Rating			30**	42**	37**	21±	19±	10
Caseload				18±	60**	12	48**	13
Supervisor Ratings					23**	04	11	07
Number of 12 Closures						21±	36**	03
Number of 13 Closures							27**	-04
Number of 15 Closures								-00

*Decimals have been omitted from correlations.
±Significant at .05 level.
**Significant at .01 level.

TABLE 11

CLUSTER ANALYSIS FINDINGS FOR
MEASURES OF REHABILITATION COUNSELOR PERFORMANCE

Groups	Average Correlation Within Group	Average Correlation Between Group and Others	B Weight
I Size of Caseload Number of 12 Closures Number of 15 Closures	48**	13	3.69
II Co-Worker Present Rating Supervisor	33**	13	2.59

*Decimals have been omitted in correlations.
**Significant at .01 level.

TABLE 12

AVERAGE INTERCORRELATIONS OF
REHABILITATION COUNSELOR PERFORMANCE CRITERIA
WITH THE TWO CLUSTERS AND ALL OTHER VARIABLES

Variables	Group I (4, 6, 8)	Group II (1, 3, 5)	All Others
Co-Worker Ratings	-02*	30***	13
Case Velocity	01	12	11
Present State Rating	29***	36***	25***
Caseload	56***	15	28***
Supervisor Rating	17**	39***	21**
Number of 12 Closures	52***	22***	27***
Number of 13 Closures	20**	08	12
Number of 15 Closures	44***	13	24***

*Decimals have been omitted from correlations.
**Significant at .05 level.
***Significant at .01 level.

it includes size of caseload, number of 12 closures, and number of 15 closures. The second cluster might be called "performance rating" since it includes the three rating indices of our study. As we can see, neither case velocity nor number of 13 closures clustered with the "case management" cluster, although they both correlated to a slight degree with two of the variables of the cluster.

The average correlation of each variable with the two clusters and with all other variables is presented in Table 12. From it, we can see that present state rating procedures and supervisor ratings have significant average intercorrelations with both clusters, as well as with all other variables.

Summary

This chapter reports the relationship of eight performance measures and a measure of job satisfaction when these were applied to 143 rehabilitation counselors in six states. A cluster analysis of the intercorrelations showed two clusters which included three variables each. The clusters were labelled "case management" and "performance rating." Two of the performance variables and the job satisfaction scores did not contribute to either cluster. The implications of these findings for state vocational rehabilitation agency practice and for further research were briefly considered.

APPENDIX C

CO-WORKER RATING BLANK

We are asking for your help in a research project which concerns the evaluation procedures used towards the work of the rehabilitation counselor. This project - under way since November 1959 and supported by VRA - we hope will help define some of the problems and pertinent dimensions by which such an evaluation can be approached.

One variable we want to study in our project is the perceptions which counselors have about the work of fellow counselors. We feel that co-workers are perhaps in a good position to know some aspects of that work since they have a chance to interact and listen to each other - all of which helps them form some idea of how well the other counselor is performing his job. With this in mind, we thought that one important measure of counselor performance would be the perceptions of fellow workers.

The blank should be completed in the following manner:

1. On the last page of the blank, there is a list of names sectioned into district offices. In front of each name there is a number.

2. From this list, select the counselors which appear in the same section as your name, and put their numbers in the squares at the top of page 2 - above the items to be rated. The initials, etc., of each person may be put below each number in order to help you remember who they are. Please rate all counselors in that section, including yourself. (If you are a supervisor, please rate all the counselors in the section that has your district office in the title. You need not rate yourself.)

3. On page 2, there are seven items of a counselor's work on which the people you selected should be compared. On the scale for each item, all the numbers you selected should be placed.

   E.g.: 12 : 2,4 : 9 : 8 : 11 : 7,3 : ____ : 15,20
   Is most like ... Is least like

4. On each item, you will compare the behavior, as you see it, of each person you selected to the behavior of the best counselors you have known - or to what you feel the behavior of the best counselor should be. In effect, you are comparing how "like" or similar to your ideal the behavior of the selected counselors corresponds. If it is "most like" your ideal, then the number should be placed near or at the "most like" end, depending on how nearly you feel it is like. If it is "least like," then the other end of the scale should be used, depending on how strongly you feel it is "least like" your ideal.

5. Work on one item at a time; put all numbers selected on one scale and then move to the next item.

Your reply will be held in strictest confidence; only the investigators have the coding key which identifies each blank. In our analysis of these data, neither individuals, district offices, nor states will be identifiable.

CO-WORKER RATING BLANK

Numbers of people to be rated

1. In his knowledge of rehabilitation concepts (medical, psychological, vocational, etc.), the counselor .....

_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____
Is most like Is least like

2. In collecting sufficient information and using it effectively in evaluating a case, the counselor .....

_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____
Is least like Is most like

3. In learning from experience and showing an attitude of wanting to overcome his shortcomings, the counselor .....

_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____
Is most like Is least like

4. In giving clients appropriate information and in a manner which is meaningful, the counselor .....

_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____
Is least like Is most like

5. In knowledge about and working relationships with the major community rehabilitation services and agencies, the counselor ...

_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____
Is most like Is least like

6. In creating an atmosphere during counseling sessions which makes it easier for clients to deal with their problems, the counselor ..

_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____
Is least like Is most like

7. In the over-all performance of his job, the counselor .....

_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____
Is most like Is least like

APPENDIX D

JOB SATISFACTION INVENTORY

This inventory is another part of our study into the criteria problem in evaluating the work of the rehabilitation counselor. We are sure that most would agree that satisfaction with a job is a vital component in the performance of that job. This variable we want to include in our study.

The following specific statements concern your feelings, beliefs, and attitudes. There are 70 items in this inventory. For each statement, a five-point scale is provided indicating whether you rarely, sometimes, frequently, generally, or almost always do, feel, or see others as doing as the statement suggests. Thus, for example, you would check the space "R" on the scale if you <u>rarely</u> engage in the activity described:

	R	S	F	G	A
I worry a lot about my job.	X	:	:	:	:

Or, see others as engaging <u>rarely</u> in an activity:

The policies and problems of the people under whom I work are adequately explained to me.	X	:	:	:	:

To aid you in answering this inventory, the terms rarely, sometimes, frequently, generally, and almost always have been defined on a percentage basis, as follows:

"R" - Rarely:	means from 0 to 15 per cent of the time.
"S" - Sometimes:	means from 16 to 35 per cent of the time.
"F" - Frequently:	means from 36 to 65 per cent of the time.
"G" - Generally:	means from 66 to 85 per cent of the time.
"A" - Almost Always:	means from 86 to 100 per cent of the time.

These per cent listings have been given at the top of each page in the inventory. There are no "right" or "wrong" answers to these statements. Work as rapidly as you can without being careless, and do not spend too much time on any one statement.

"R" - Rarely (0% to 15%)	"G" - Generally (66% to 85%)
"S" - Sometimes (16% to 35%)	"A" - Almost Always (86% to 100%)
"F" - Frequently (36% to 65%)	

Answer every question.

	R	S	F	G	A
1. If I had a choice, I would choose a job in my present line of work over one in any other line of work.	____	____	____	____	____
2. I feel that I have an adequate understanding of what is expected of me in my job.	____	____	____	____	____
3. It is necessary for me to do things I dislike in order to get promotions.	____	____	____	____	____
4. I feel that to me others could make my work easier if they cared to do so.	____	____	____	____	____
5. I worry a lot about my daily work.	____	____	____	____	____
6. I feel if I could start over again, at 18, I would choose a different line of work.	____	____	____	____	____
7. I feel that people in general respect my job.	____	____	____	____	____
8. There are too many people telling me what to do.	____	____	____	____	____
9. I feel that I can always trust the people under whom I work.	____	____	____	____	____
10. My life would seem empty without my work to occupy me.	____	____	____	____	____
11. My present job requires me to work too long hours.	____	____	____	____	____
12. I am glad to get back to my job after a vacation.	____	____	____	____	____
13. I feel that I am as efficient as the average person with whom I work.	____	____	____	____	____
14. My work is too confining to suit me.	____	____	____	____	____
15. I feel I am paid a fair salary for the work I do.	____	____	____	____	____
16. I feel that my work utilizes my full capacities.	____	____	____	____	____

"R" - Rarely (0% to 15%)

"S" - Sometimes (16% to 35%)

"F" - Frequently (36% to 65%)

"G" - Generally (66% to 85%)

"A" - Almost Always (86% to 100%)

Answer every question.

		R	S	F	G	A
17.	I feel that I am "in a rut" vocationally.	____	____	____	____	____
18.	I feel that I know where I stand with my present employer.	____	____	____	____	____
19.	I feel that my work has a bad effect on my health.	____	____	____	____	____
20.	I come home upset, angry or irritable because of something that happened at work.	____	____	____	____	____
21.	I feel competent and fully able to handle my job.	____	____	____	____	____
22.	I feel my work suffers because I have too much to do.	____	____	____	____	____
23.	I would decline an opportunity to change my present job for one of equal pay, security and status.	____	____	____	____	____
24.	I think it is possible to attain my vocational goals in that portion of life that is still ahead of me.	____	____	____	____	____
25.	I feel that my family and friends respect my vocation.	____	____	____	____	____
26.	I feel there is adequate transportation available to me in going to and from work, as well as in my work when called for.	____	____	____	____	____
27.	I think I really wanted to enter my present job when I started it.	____	____	____	____	____
28.	I regard my present position as a lifetime career.	____	____	____	____	____
29.	I think my present job is in the area of work (not necessarily the same job) I wish to remain in permanently.	____	____	____	____	____

"R" - Rarely (0% to 15%)	"G" - Generally (66% to 85%)
"S" - Sometimes (16% to 35%)	"A" - Almost Always (86% to 100%)
"F" - Frequently (36% to 65%)	

Answer every question.

		R	S	F	G	A
30.	I expect my job to give me more satisfaction the longer I have it.	____	____	____	____	____
31.	I feel I have had definite adequate preparation for the job I now hold.	____	____	____	____	____
32.	I feel I have made real and lasting friends among my working associates.	____	____	____	____	____
33.	My position forces me to work with certain individuals whom I dislike.	____	____	____	____	____
34.	I get discouraged in my present job.	____	____	____	____	____
35.	I feel that my job detracts from my status in the community where I live.	____	____	____	____	____
36.	I consider my work surroundings to be as pleasant as they should be.	____	____	____	____	____
37.	I feel I have eventual retirement security in my job.	____	____	____	____	____
38.	I get restless during working hours, and feel that the day is dragging endlessly.	____	____	____	____	____
39.	I feel that there should be more people to help with the work I am doing.	____	____	____	____	____
40.	I like my present job better than any other I have ever had.	____	____	____	____	____
41.	My job gives me more real personal satisfaction than the things I do in my spare time.	____	____	____	____	____
42.	I feel my occupation forces me to live in home surroundings which are uncomfortable or inadequate according to my standards.	____	____	____	____	____

"R" - Rarely (0% to 15%)

"S" - Sometimes (16% to 35%)

"F" - Frequently (36% to 65%)

"G" - Generally (66% to 85%)

"A" - Almost Always (86% to 100%)

Answer every question.

		R	S	F	G	A
43.	I wonder whether the people under whom I work approve of my work.	____	____	____	____	____
44.	I think my job gets more difficult for me each year.	____	____	____	____	____
45.	My present job gets me badly flustered and jittery.	____	____	____	____	____
46.	The policies and problems of the people under whom I work are adequately explained to me.	____	____	____	____	____
47.	I feel that my general interests and attitudes are about the same as those of my fellow workers who have similar jobs.	____	____	____	____	____
48.	The method of payment of my earnings causes me inconvenience.	____	____	____	____	____
49.	I feel at ease in the presence of the people under whom I work.	____	____	____	____	____
50.	I am so interested in my work that I talk about it a great deal even after working hours.	____	____	____	____	____
51.	I feel I am kept from living as I would like because of insufficient income.	____	____	____	____	____
52.	I am satisfied with the degree to which my present job gives me an opportunity to express my own ideas.	____	____	____	____	____
53.	I find my work so interesting that it is on my mind a lot when I am not at work.	____	____	____	____	____
54.	I feel I have made a success of my job thus far in my career.	____	____	____	____	____
55.	My present job forces me to maintain too fast a pace.	____	____	____	____	____

"R" - Rarely (0% to 15%)

"S" - Sometimes (16% to 35%)

"F" - Frequently (36% to 65%)

"G" - Generally (66% to 85%)

"A" - Almost Always (86% to 100%)

Answer every question.

		R	S	F	G	A
56.	I feel that my working associates regard me as an equal.	____	____	____	____	____
57.	I feel that I must look outside my work for those things that make life worthwhile and interesting.	____	____	____	____	____
58.	My income is sufficient to meet my financial obligations and support my family.	____	____	____	____	____
59.	I feel that my associates stimulate me to do better work.	____	____	____	____	____
60.	I think my job has "smothered" my personality.	____	____	____	____	____
61.	My vocational future looks promising to me.	____	____	____	____	____
62.	I feel that I am really interested in my present job.	____	____	____	____	____
63.	I get along well with the persons with whom I work on my present job.	____	____	____	____	____
64.	The people under whom I work make available the materials, information and assistance required to do my best work.	____	____	____	____	____
65.	I feel that the people under whom I work make unfair demands on my free time.	____	____	____	____	____
66.	I am afraid of losing my job.	____	____	____	____	____
67.	I feel that I will become more proficient at my work the longer I have it.	____	____	____	____	____
68.	Those with whom I work seem unreasonable in their dealings with me.	____	____	____	____	____
69.	I feel my present job helps me toward the financial goals I have set for myself.	____	____	____	____	____

"R" - Rarely (0% to 15%)	"G" - Generally (66% to 85%)
"S" - Sometimes (16% to 35%)	"A" - Almost Always (86% to 100%)
"F" - Frequently (36% to 65%)	

Answer every question.

	R	S	F	G	A
70. The people under whom I work are desirous of and willing to make improvements in my working conditions.	____:	____:	____:	____:	____

You may use the rest of this sheet for any comments you would like to make concerning this inventory. Thank you for your help.

REFERENCES

Apostal, R. Two methods of evaluating vocational counseling. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1960, 7, 171-175.

Bellows, R. Procedures for validating vocational criteria. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1941, 25, 499-513.

Bellows, R. Psychology of personnel in business and industry. New York: Prentice-Hall, 1949.

Bendig, A. Rater experience and case history judgments of adjustments. Journal of Clinical Psychology, 1955, 11, 127-133.

Bendig, A., & Sprague, J. Rater experience and the reliability of case history ratings of adjustment. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1954, 18, 207-211.

Blalock, H. Social statistics. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1960.

Brams, J. Counselor characteristics and effective communication in counseling. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1961, 8, 25-30.

Brayfield, A. H., & Crockett, W. H. Employee attitudes and employee performance. Psychological Bulletin, 1955, 52, 396-424.

Brogden, H., & Taylor, E. The theory and classification of criterion bias. Educational and Psychological Measurement, 1950, 10, 159-186.

Carlson, R. E., Dawis, R. V., England, G. W., & Lofquist, L. H. The measurement of employment satisfaction. Minnesota Studies in Vocational Rehabilitation, XIII. Minneapolis: Industrial Relations Center, 1962.

Carlson, R. E., Dawis, R. V., England, G. W., & Lofquist, L. H. The measurement of employment satisfactoriness. Minnesota Studies in Vocational Rehabilitation, XIV. Minneapolis: Industrial Relations Center, 1963.

Cohen, L. Vocational planning and mental illness. Personnel and Guidance Journal, 1955, 34, 28-32.

Coker, D. L. A study of the effects of training residence hall advisers in interview procedures. Unpublished M.A. thesis, University of Iowa, 1961.

Cronbach, L. J., & Gleser, G. C. Assessing similarity between profiles. Psychological Bulletin, 1953, 50, 456-473.

Deterline, W., & Bendig, A. The interdependence of ratings of case histories. Journal of Clinical Psychology, 1956, 12, 79-82.

DiMichael, S. G. Work satisfaction and work efficiency of vocational counselors as related to measured interests. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1949, 33, 319-339.

Dollard, J., & Mowrer, O. A method of measuring tension in written documents. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1947, 42, 3-32.

Ebel, R. Estimation of the reliability of ratings. Psychometrika, 1951, 16, 407-424.

Eddy, R. T. Interest patterns of rehabilitation counselors. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1960, 7, 202-211.

England, G. Development and use of weighted blanks. Dubuque, Iowa: Wm. C. Brown, 1961.

Flanagan, J. Critical requirements: a new approach to employee evaluation. Personnel Psychology, 1949, 2, 419-425.

Garner, W. Uncertainty and structure as psychological concepts. New York: Wiley, 1962.

Gaylord, R. H., & Stunkel, E.R. Validity and the criterion. Educational and Psychological Measurement, 1954, 14, 294-300.

Ghiselli, E. Differentiation of tests in terms of the accuracy with which they predict for a given individual. Educational and Psychological Measurement, 1960, 20, 675-684.

Ghiselli, E., & Brown, C. Personnel and industrial psychology. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1955.

Githens, W. Research findings and methodology in the United States Navy. Paper read at American Psychological Association convention, September, 1965.

Grant, C. W. The counselor's role. Personnel and Guidance Journal, 1954, 33, 74-77.

Guilford, J. Psychometric methods. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1954.

Guilford, J. Fundamental statistics in psychology and education. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1961.

Gulliksen, H. Theory of mental tests. New York: John Wiley, 1950.

Habbe, S. Appraisal of job performance. National Industrial Conference Board Reports, No. 121. New York: Author, 1951.

Hahn, M. E. The training of rehabilitation counselors. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1954, 1, 246-248.

Hansen, R. W. An investigation into the relationship of some personality characteristics with the tendency of rehabilitation counselor trainees to enter employment in a rehabilitation setting. Unpublished M.A. Equivalency, University of Iowa, 1961.

Hall, J. H., & Warren, S. L. (Eds.) Rehabilitation counselor preparation. Washington, D.C.: National Rehabilitation Association and National Vocational Guidance Association, 1956.

Heron, A. Satisfaction and satisfactoriness: complementary aspects of occupational adjustment. Occupational Psychology, 1954, 28, 140-153.

Herzberg, F., Mausner, B., Peterson, R. O., & Capwell, Dora F. Job attitudes: review of research and opinion. Pittsburgh: Psychological Service of Pittsburgh, 1957.

Hobbs, N. The development of a code of ethical standards for psychology. American Psychologist, 1958, 3, 80-84.

Hulin, C. L., & Smith, Patricia C. Sex differences in job satisfaction. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1964, 48, 88-92.

Jacobs, J. The application of sociometry to industry. Sociometry, 1945, 8, 181-198.

Jaques, Marceline E. Critical counseling behavior in rehabilitation settings. Iowa City, Iowa: University of Iowa, 1959.

Jenkins, J. Validity for what? Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1946, 10, 93-98.

Jensen, B., Coles, G., & Nestor, B. The criterion problem in guidance research. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1955, 2, 58-61.

Jensen, B., Terebinski, S. J., & Ellis, W. R. The importance of criterion definition. Journal of American Society of Training Directors, 1960, 2, 3-7.

Johnson, B. Role conflict in rehabilitation counseling. Unpublished doctoral dissertaion, University of Missouri, 1961.

Johnson, G. An instrument for the measurement of job satisfaction. Personnel Psychology, 1955, 8, 27-37.

Johnson, R. H., & Patterson, C. H. Vocational objectives for the emotionally disabled. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1957, 4, 291-296.

Johnston, L. T. The counselor as he really is. Journal of Rehabilitation, 1957, 33, 9-10.

Kahn, R. L. Productivity and job satisfaction. Personnel Psychology, 1960, 13, 275-287.

Katzell, R. A. Personal values, job satisfaction, and job behavior. In H. Borow (Ed.), Man in a world at work. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1964. Pp. 341-363.

Katzell, R. A., Barrett, R. S., & Treadway, C. Job satisfaction, job performance, and situational characteristics. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1961, 45, 65-72.

Kelley, H.H., & Thibaut, J.W. Experimental studies of group problem solving and process. In G. Lindzey (Ed.), Handbook of social psychology. Vol. 2. Special fields and applications. Cambridge, Mass.: Addison-Wesley, 1954. Pp. 735-785.

Kirchner, W., & Dunnette, M. Applying the weighted application blank technique to a variety of office jobs. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1957, 41, 206-208.

Lindquist, E. F. Design and analysis of experiments. Cambridge, Mass.: Riverside Press, 1953.

Lindzey, G., & Borgatta, E. Sociometric measurement. In G. Lindzey (Ed.), Handbook of Social psychology. Vol. 1. Theory and Method. Cambridge, Mass.: Addison-Wesley, 1954. Pp. 405-448.

McAlees, D. C., & Warren, S. L. Increasing the supply of qualified rehabilitation counseling personnel in state vocational rehabilitation agencies. Unpublished manuscript, Vocational Rehabilitation Administration, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, 1965.

McGowan, J. F. The counselor as others see him. Journal of Rehabilitation, 1957, 23 (May-June), 7-9.

Miller, L. A. A study of a case-review criterion for evaluating rehabilitation counselor performance. Unpublished doctoral dissertaion, University of Iowa, 1963.

Moed, G. Procedures and practices in pre-vocational evaluation: a review of current programs. In J. Muthard (Ed.), Proceedings of the Iowa conference on pre-vocational activities. Iowa City, Iowa: University of Iowa, 1960.

Moriarty, E. The supervisor in a state rehabilitation agency. Journal of Rehabilitation, 1959, 25, 2, 24-25.

Mosel, J., & Wade, R. A weighted application blank for reduction of turnover in department store sales-clerks. Personnel Psychology, 1951, 4, 177-184.

Muthard, J. E., & Miller, L. A. Evaluation of rehabilitation counselor performance: a survey of state agency practices. Personnel and Guidance Journal, 1963, 42, 274-279.

Muthard, J. E., & Miller, L. A. Criteria for rehabilitation counselor performance in state vocational rehabilitation agencies. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1964, 11, 123-128.

Nagle, B. Criterion development. Personnel Psychology, 1953, 6, 271-289.

National Industrial Conference Board. Studies in personnel policy. Personnel Practices in Factory and Office. No. 145. New York: Author, 1954.

Newton, R. The clinician as judge: total Rorschach and clinical case material. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1954, 18, 248-250.

Osgood, C. E., Suci, G. J., & Tannenbaum, P. H. The measurement of meaning. Urbana, Ill.: University of Illinois Press, 1957.

Patterson, C. H. Counselor or coordinator? Journal of Rehabilitation, 1957, 23 (May-June), 13-15.

Patterson, C. H. Counseling the emotionally disturbed. New York: Harper, 1958.

Patterson, C. H. Test characteristics of rehabilitation counselor trainees. Journal of Rehabilitation, 1962, 28, 5, 15-16.

Remmers, H. Rating methods in research on teaching. In N. Gage (Ed.), Handbook of research on teaching. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1963. Pp. 329-378.

Robinson, H. Job satisfaction researches of 1955. Personnel and Guidance Journal, 1956, 34, 565-568.

Robinson, H. Job satisfaction researches of 1956. Personnel and Guidance Journal, 1957, 36, 34-37.

Robinson, H. Job satisfaction researches of 1958. Personnel and Guidance Journal, 1959, 37, 669-673.

Robinson, H., & Conners, R. P. Job satisfaction researches of 1961. Personnel and Guidance Journal, 1962, 41, 240-246.

Robinson, H., & Conners, R. P. Job satisfaction researches of 1962. Personnel and Guidance Journal, 1963, 42, 136-142.

Ross, I., & Zander, A. Need satisfaction and employee turnover. Personnel Psychology, 1957, 10, 327-338.

Rusalem, H. An analysis of the functions of state vocational rehabilitation counselors with implications for the development of a training course at teachers college. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1951.

Schubert, M. Field work performance: achievement levels of first-year students in selected aspects of casework service. Social Service Review, 1958, 32, 120-137.

Scott, T. B., Dawis, R. V., England, G. W., & Lofquist, L. H. A definition of work adjustment. Minnesota Studies in Vocational Rehabilitation, X. Minneapolis: Industrial Relations Center, 1960.

Scurlock, V. Supervision in state rehabilitation agencies. Journal of Rehabilitation, 1958, 24, 4, 7-9.

Severin, D. The predictability of various kinds of criteria. Personnel Psychology, 1952, 5, 93-104.

Sluckin, W. Combining criteria of occupational success: Part I. Occupational Psychology, 1956, 30, 20-26.

Sluckin, W. Combining criteria of occupational success: Part II. Occupational Psychology, 1956, 30, 57-68.

Smith, C. E. A survey of opinion upon the occupational role of the rehabilitation counselor. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Missouri, 1960.

Smits, S. J. Rehabilitation counselor recruitment study: final report. Washington, D.C.: National Rehabilitation Association, 1964.

Spencer, G. J., & Worthington, R. Validity of a projective technique in predicting sales effectiveness. Personnel Psychology, 1952, 5, 125-144.

Super, D. The criteria of vocational success. Occupations, 1951, 30, 5-9.

Swineford, F. The measurement of a personality trait. Journal of Educational Psychology, 1938, 29, 295-300.

Tate, M. Statistics in education. New York: Macmillan, 1955.

Taylor, E., & Hastman, R. Relation of format and administration to the characteristics of graphic rating scales. Personnel Psychology, 1956, 9, 181-206.

Thorndike, R. (Ed.). Research problems and techniques, Report No. 3, Army Air Forces Aviation Psychology Program. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1947.

Thorndike, R. Personnel selection. New York: John Wiley, 1949.

Thorndike, R. Reliability. In E. Lindquist (Ed.), Educational measurement. Menasha, Wis.: George Banta, 1951. Pp. 560-620.

Truax, W. E. Critical requirements of small school counselors. Personnel and Guidance Journal, 1956, 35, 103-106.

Tryon, R. C. Cluster analysis. Ann Arbor, Mich.: Edward Bros., 1939.

Vallance, T., Glickman, A. S., & Suci, G. J. Criterion rationale for a personnel research program. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1953, 37, 429-431.

Wagner, R. F. A study of the critical requirements for dentists. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Pittsburgh, 1949.

Warren, S. L. The rehabilitation counselor today. Journal of Rehabilitation, 1959, 25, 5, 7-9.

Wherry, R. Criteria and validity. In D. H. Fryer & E. Henry (Eds.), Handbook of applied psychology. New York: Rinehart, 1950. Pp. 170-176.

Wherry, R. The past and future of criterion evaluation. Personnel Psychology, 1957, 10, 1-5.

Wherry, R., & Fryer, D. H. Buddy ratings: popularity contest or leadership criteria? Sociometry, 1949, 12, 179-190.

Wolfe, E. W. Staff evaluations: a key to effective performance. Journal of Rehabilitation, 1960, 26, 4, 19-22.

Ziller, R. Vocational choice and utility for risk. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1957, 4, 61-64.